

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections. Claims 12-16 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-11 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 23-30 have been added. Thus, claims 12-20 and 22-30 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

The Advisory Action reaffirms the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed toward non-statutory matter. More particularly, the Advisory Action alleges, *inter alia*, that the role allocation module and function allocation module in claim 1 do not fall within any of the four statutory categories of process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection.

Without agreeing as to any alleged basis of the above rejection, and solely in order to advance the application to allowance, Applicants cancel claims 1-11 without prejudice, rendering moot the above rejection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 1-11 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over Owens, Sadhwani-Tully and Griffin

The Advisory Action reaffirms the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious in light of Owens et al., USPN 6,315,572 (hereinafter “*Owens*”) in view of Sadhwani-Tully, USPN 6,785,822 (hereinafter “*Sadhwani-Tully*”) and in further view of Griffin et al., USPN 6,917,975 (hereinafter “*Griffin*”). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by one or more prior art references. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. As noted above, Applicants cancel claims 1-10 herein, rendering moot the above rejection as applied thereto. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection as applied to pending claims 12-20 and 22.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-cited references fail to render obvious any of claims 12-20 and 22, based at least on the failure of *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully* and *Griffin* to teach or suggest (emphasis added):

“...storing a **respective set of allocation data for each function** in a set of functions of an authoring tool which are available to a user, **each set of allocation data including a respective allocation setting for each of an instructional design role and a content definition role** for the user to assume with respect to the authoring tool, each allocation setting indicating an ability of the respective function to be allocated to the respective role;..”

as variously recited in each of currently amended independent claims 12 and 22. The claim amendments are supported in the original disclosure at least by FIG. 9 and by the description thereof in paragraphs [0044]-[0046] of the specification.

In rejecting the above claims, the Final Office Action mailed January 28, 2008 offers *Sadhwani-Tully* as disclosing tabs 402, 408, 410, 412, 418 of a profile configuration dialog box alleged to anticipate various claim limitations directed to role allocation and function allocation. Without agreeing as to the above characterization of *Sadhwani-Tully*, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in *Sadhwani-Tully* teaches or suggests storing allocation settings for a particular function, each allocation setting for a respective role in a set of roles, each allocation setting indicating an ability of the particular function to be allocated to the respective role. Therefore, *Sadhwani-Tully* necessarily fails to more particularly teach or suggest storing such role-specific allocation settings for each function in a set of functions.

By contrast, each of currently amended independent claims 12 and 22 recites storing a respective set of allocation data for each function in a set of functions of an authoring tool which are available to a user, each set of allocation data including a respective allocation setting for each of an instructional design role and a content definition role for the user to assume with respect to the authoring tool, each allocation setting indicating an ability of the respective function to be allocated to the respective role. The Advisory Action does not offer *Owens* or *Griffin* as teaching or suggesting those limitations of currently amended independent claims 12 and 22 which are not taught or suggested by *Sadhwani-Tully* alone. Applicants submit that no combination of *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully* and *Griffin* teaches or suggests the above cited storing of a

respective set of allocation data for each function in a set of functions. Therefore, the cited references fail to either teach or suggest at least one limitation of the invention as variously recited in each of independent claims 12 and 22.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 12 and 22 is non-obvious in light of *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully* and *Griffin*. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claims depending therefrom are also non-obvious. *See* M.P.E.P. §2143.03. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 12-20 and 22 based on *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully* and *Griffin* be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully*, *Griffin* and *Boon*

The Advisory Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of *Owens* in view of *Sadhwani-Tully* in further view of *Griffin* and in further view of *Boon*, USPN 2004/0219494 (hereinafter “*Boon*”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection.

As discussed above, without agreeing as to any alleged basis of the above rejection, and solely in order to advance the application to allowance, Applicants cancel claim 11 without prejudice, rendering moot the above rejection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claims 11 based on *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully*, *Griffin* and *Boon* be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 23-30, which variously depend from claim 22. New claims 23-30 are supported in the original disclosure at least by original claims 13-20 and by at least by FIG. 9 and by the description thereof in paragraphs [0044]-[0046] of the specification.

It is Applicants’ understanding that new claims 23-30 are allowable in view of the references cited in the Advisory Action. More particularly, claims 23-30 are allowable at least insofar as they depend from currently amended independent claim 22, and therefore incorporate limitations which are shown herein to be non-obvious in light of any combination of *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully*, *Griffin* and *Boon*.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 12-20 and 22-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: May 28, 2008

/Dermot G. Miller/
Dermot G. Miller
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 58,309

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778